



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,187	12/16/2005	Satoshi Araki	277514US6PCT	3916
22850 7590 04/07/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER STU, SARAH				
ART UNIT 2431		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/07/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,187

Applicant(s)

ARAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Sarah Su

Art Unit

2431

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

FINAL ACTION

1. Amendment D, received on 5 January 2010, has been entered into record. In this amendment, claims 1, 10-12, 23, and 24 have been amended.
2. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 10-14, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu (US 2002/0087892 A1) and in view of Okamoto et al. (US 2002/0073102 A1 and Okamoto hereinafter).

As to claims 1, 10-12, and 23-24, Imazu discloses a system and method for authentication, the system and method having:

**receiving registration completion information (i.e. login screen display)
transmitted from the management apparatus after completing registration**

with the first user identification information, the first password, and the first apparatus name (0065, lines 5-9; 0072, lines 1-3).

wherein the management apparatus manages the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13).

Imazu fails to specifically disclose:

transmitting registration information according to an external input, the registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus together with a first password corresponding to the first user identification information; subsequently transmitting a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus to a management apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as taught by Okamoto.

Okamoto discloses a system and method for distributing digital data, the system and method having:

transmitting registration information according to an external input, the registration information including a first user identification information for use in utilizing a service in a service utilizing apparatus together with a first password corresponding to the first user identification information (0115, lines 1-5; 0116, lines 4-5);

subsequently transmitting a first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus to a management apparatus (0118, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of Okamoto, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Okamoto by registering a user and a device. Okamoto recites motivation by disclosing that administering rights information of digital data and authorizing users using a stored device ID at a distribution server increases security while distributing data (0016, lines 1-6; 0017, lines 1-7). It is obvious that the teachings of Okamoto would have improved the teachings of Imazu by registering a user and a device in order to increase security while distributing data.

As to claim 13, Imazu discloses:

wherein in the registering, if the first user identification information, the first password, and the first apparatus name received from a first service utilizing apparatus are associated and registered (0014, lines 3-9, 11-13),

but does not explicitly disclose:

a second user identification information, a second password, and a second apparatus name identical to the first apparatus name are received from a second service utilizing apparatus, and the second user identification information is different from the user identification information, then the second user identification information, the second password, and the second apparatus name are associated with one

another and registered. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a second user on the same terminal using different user information since it was known in the art that personal authentication using user name and password is needed in a multi-user computer system or network to verify that the communicating party is real, as shown in Imazu (0006, lines 15-23).

As to claims 2 and 14, Imazu discloses:

receiving authentication request information comprising the first user identification information (i.e. login identifier) and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0014, lines 11-14);

performing an authentication process based on the received first user identification information and first password (0077, lines 1-6);

transmitting authentication results (i.e. URL of registration screen) of the authentication process to the service utilizing apparatus as a result of transmitting the authentication results to the service utilizing apparatus (0072, lines 1-3);

Imazu fails to specifically disclose:

receiving contents identification information about at least predetermined contents data for request of the contents data transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus;

**transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received
contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus.**

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as taught by Okamoto.

Okamoto discloses:

**receiving contents identification information about at least
predetermined contents data for request of the contents data transmitted
from the service utilizing apparatus (0130, lines 1-3);**

**transmitting the contents data corresponding to the received
contents identification information to the service utilizing apparatus (0111,
lines 1-4; 0149, lines 12-16, 24-26).**

Given the teaching of Okamoto, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Okamoto by receiving an indicator of requested data and transmitting the data. Please refer to the motivation recited above with respect to claims 1, 10- 12, 23, and 24 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Okamoto to the teachings of Imazu.

As to claim 25, Imazu discloses:

**the first registration information transmitting means transmits the
first user identification information (i.e. login identifier) and the first**

password as authentication request information to the management apparatus (0014, lines 11-14).

6. Claims 3-8 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Okamoto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aboulhosn et al. (US 2004/0068524 A1 and Aboulhosn hereinafter).

As to claims 3 and 15, Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of a second apparatus registered as associated with a second user identification information different from the first user identification information to the service utilizing apparatus;
receiving the name of the second apparatus transmitted according to the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus;
displaying the received name of the second apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses a system and method for peer-to-peer file sharing, the system and method having:

transmitting apparatus name request information about a request for a name of a second apparatus registered as associated with a second user

identification information different from the first user identification

information to the service utilizing apparatus (0015, lines 21-23);

**receiving the name of the second apparatus transmitted according to
the apparatus name request information from the management apparatus**

(0014, lines 2-6);

displaying the received name of the second apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving and displaying another apparatus name. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that receiving and displaying other apparatus names allows files to be shared with groups (0014, lines 3-4) and for a user to view the shared file structure (0019, lines 1-3). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto by receiving and displaying another apparatus name in order to allow for files to be shared and for the file structure to be viewed.

As to claims 4 and 16, Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

**receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not
the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses
transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published;**

registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

receiving disclosure setting information indicating whether or not the apparatus names of the plurality of service utilizing apparatuses transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus are to be published (i.e. accept or decline) (0016, lines 17-21);

registering the received disclosure setting information and the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus as associated with each other (0016, lines 20-21).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by registering an apparatus with disclosure information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that registering an apparatus with information regarding its group membership ensures that a computer system is authorized to be a member (0016, lines 5-7). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings

of Imazu in view of Okamoto by registering an apparatus with membership information in order to ensure that a computer is authorized to be a member.

As to claims 5 and 17, Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

**receiving the name of the second apparatus set to be published
among the names of second apparatuses registered as associated with
second user identification information.**

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

**receiving the name of the second apparatus set to be published
among the names of second apparatuses registered as associated with
second user identification information (0016, lines 20-21).**

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by receiving the name of another apparatus to be registered. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claims 4 and 16 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto.

As to claims 6 and 18, Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester of predetermined contents data and comprising the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the second apparatus name of the second service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data;

transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the second service utilizing apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

receiving distribution request information which is transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus as a distribution requester (i.e. file sharing system) of predetermined contents data and comprising the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus, contents identification information about the contents data, and the second apparatus name of the second service utilizing apparatus which is a provider of the contents data (0013, lines 24-27);

transmitting the contents data according to the received distribution request information to the second service utilizing apparatus (0013, lines 26-27).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by transferring information to a requested apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that providing a copy of a file to an accessing member allows peer-to-peer file sharing (0013, lines 13-14), reducing the need for a centralized storage space (0003, lines 9-10). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto by transferring data to a requested system in order to allow file sharing and reduce the amount of centralized storage space needed.

As to claim 7, Imazu discloses:

transmitting a second user identification information and a second password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).

Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

displaying information about a second apparatus name corresponding to the second user identification information and the second password in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

displaying information about a second apparatus name (i.e. computer system identifier) corresponding to the second user identification information and the second password in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus (0020, lines 3-7).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying information about an apparatus. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that sharing apparatus information allows other group members to be notified of newly shared or modified files (0013, lines 27-29). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto by sharing apparatus information in order to update file sharing information with group members.

As to claim 8, Imazu discloses:

transmitting a second user identification information and a second password to the management apparatus (0014, lines 10-13).

Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

displaying information about the service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to the second identification information about the service;

transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

displaying information about the service used in the apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus in an authentication reply transmitted from the management apparatus according to the second identification information about the service (0019, lines 1-5);

transmitting information for permission of deleting the apparatus name registered in the management apparatus according to an external input (0018, lines 1-3).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn by displaying file sharing information and transmitting apparatus deletion information. Aboulhosn recites motivation by disclosing that displaying file sharing information provides a user interface for the shared file structure (0019, lines 11-13) and providing deletion information allows file synchronization to be suspended (0018, line 6). It is obvious that the teachings of Aboulhosn would have improved the teachings of Imazu in

view of Okamoto by displaying service information and providing deletion information in order to provide a user interface and suspend file synchronization.

As to claim 19, Imazu discloses:

authenticating the first user identification information and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).

Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the first user identification information and the first password to the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply corresponding to the authentication.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosen.

Aboulhosen discloses:

transmitting information about an apparatus name corresponding to the first user identification information and the first password to the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply corresponding to the authentication (0015, lines 4-7; 0016, lines 20-23).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosen, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosen

by transferring information about an apparatus with user information. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 7 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto.

As to claim 20, Imazu discloses:

authenticating the first user identification information and the first password transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus (0077, lines 1-6).

Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

transmitting identification information about a service used by the first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Aboulhosn.

Aboulhosn discloses:

transmitting identification information about a service used by the first apparatus name of the service utilizing apparatus together with an authentication reply to the service utilizing apparatus (0016, lines 20-23; 0015, lines 4-7; 0019, lines 1-5).

Given the teaching of Aboulhosn, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Aboulhosn

by sending information about file sharing (i.e. service) of an apparatus. Please refer to the motivation recited above in respect to claim 8 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Aboulhosn to the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto.

7. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Okamoto as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, further in view of Oho et al. (US 2002/0184515 A1 and Oho hereinafter).

As to claims 9 and 21, Imazu fails to specifically disclose:

storing the first apparatus name.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu, as taught by Okamoto.

Okamoto discloses:

storing the first apparatus name (0118, lines 1-5; 0119, lines 1-3).

Given the teaching of Okamoto, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu with the teachings of Okamoto by storing an apparatus name. Please refer to the motivation disclosed above with respect to claims 1, 10-12, 23, and 24 as to why it is obvious to apply the teachings of Okamoto to the teachings of Imazu.

Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the first stored apparatus name to the management apparatus;

receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the first apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus;

deleting the stored first apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information;

transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the first apparatus name registered in the management apparatus;

receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the first apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Oho. Oho discloses a system and method for rights management, the system and method having:

transmitting deletion permission request information about a request for permission of deleting the first stored apparatus name to the management apparatus (0237, lines 9-11);

receiving deletion permission information for permission of deleting the first apparatus name according to the deletion permission request information transmitted from the management apparatus (0238, lines 1-3); deleting the stored first apparatus name according to the received deletion permission information (0239, lines 2-4); transmitting, to the management apparatus, deletion request information about a request for deletion of the first apparatus name registered in the management apparatus (0238, lines 6-11); receiving deletion completion information transmitted after completing deleting the first apparatus name and notification information according to the deletion request information from the management apparatus (0240, lines 2-7).

Given the teaching of Oho, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Oho by deleting an apparatus and sending a deletion confirmation. Oho recites motivation by disclosing that deleting an identifier from a rights database is used to control license information (0237, lines 3-6) and transmitting a deletion confirmation notifies the user that the identifier has been correctly deleted (0241, lines 8-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Oho would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto by deleting an apparatus name and providing deletion confirmation in order to control licensing information and confirm proper deletion.

8. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imazu in view of Okamoto as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Bradee (US 2002/0095571 A1) and Satyavolu et al. (US 2003/0191964 A1 and Satyavolu hereinafter).

As to claim 22, Imazu in view of Okamoto fails to specifically disclose:

performing a user authentication process based on the first user identification information and the first password received in the authentication request information receiving, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an

authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server;

issuing a service session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus, wherein,

in the receiving, the server receives the service session ID and the contents identification information;

in the transmitting, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID, and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto, as taught by Bradee.

Bradee discloses a system and method for providing system-wide computer application security using role-based identifiers, the system and method having:

performing a user authentication process based on the first user identification information and the first password received in the authentication request information receiving, issuing an authentication session ID which is a session ID with the service utilizing apparatus when

authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0041, lines 1-8);

issuing a service session ID which is a session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) with the service utilizing apparatus according to the received information about certification acknowledgement, and transmitting the issued service session ID to the service utilizing apparatus (0042, lines 2-3, 5-6), wherein, in the receiving, the server receives the service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) and the contents identification information (i.e. resource name) (0042, lines 17-19);

in the transmitting, the authentication process is performed based on the received service session ID (i.e. surrogate ID) , and the contents data corresponding to the contents identification information is transmitted to the service using apparatus when the authentication is allowed (i.e. permitting access) (0042, lines 13-16, 34-36).

Given the teaching of Bradee, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto with the teachings of Bradee by using a session ID and service session ID in the authentication process to transmit data. Bradee recites motivation by disclosing that using a session ID and surrogate ID to control access to data allows the data to be accessed for a certain amount of time before expiration (0043, lines 7-11). It is obvious that the teachings of Bradee would

have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto by using a session ID and surrogate ID to allow access to data in order to limit access to a certain amount of time.

Imazu in view of Okamoto and Bradee fails to specifically disclose:

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus;

receiving from the server an authentication ticket transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the teachings disclosed by Imazu in view of Okamoto and Bradee, as taught by Satyavolu.

Satyavolu discloses a system and method for verifying the identity of a user for session authentication purposes during web navigation, the system and method having:

receiving the authentication session ID returned from the service utilizing apparatus, receiving identification information for identification of

the server providing the contents, performing a user authentication process based on the received authentication session ID, issuing an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token) corresponding to the received identification information when the authentication is allowed, and transmitting the issued authentication ticket to the service utilizing apparatus (0030, lines 1-7; 0031, lines 1-2);

receiving from the server an authentication ticket (i.e. UNS token) transmitted from the service utilizing apparatus to the server and then performing an authentication process, and transmitting information about certification acknowledgement when the authentication is allowed to the server (0031, lines 7-9).

Given the teaching of Satyavolu, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto and Bradee with the teachings of Satyavolu by using a ticket for authentication. Satyavolu recites motivation by disclosing that a ticket allows a user to avoid traditional authentication login requirements for a certain amount of time (0031, lines 9-12). It is obvious that the teachings of Satyavolu would have improved the teachings of Imazu in view of Okamoto and Bradee by using a ticket in order to allow a user to bypass traditional login requirements for a given amount of time.

Prior Art Made of Record

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- a. Aida et al. (US 2004/0148525 A1) discloses a system and method for running software on another device.
 - b. Allen (US 2002/0115449 A1) discloses a system and method for delivering electronic information.
 - c. Bui (US 2009/0157531 A1) discloses a system and method for invoking payment service from merchant sites.
 - d. Higashi et al. (US 2004/0143661 A1) discloses a system and method for collecting content history.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Su whose telephone number is (571) 270-3835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William R. Korzuch/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/Sarah Su/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431